REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are all the claims presently pending in the application. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-11, and 13-15 are amended to more clearly define the invention. Claims 1, 10, and 14 are independent.

These amendments are made only to more particularly point out the invention for the Examiner and not for narrowing the scope of the claims or for any reason related to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Applicant also notes that, notwithstanding any claim amendments herein or later during prosecution, Applicant's intent is to encompass equivalents of all claim elements.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Iizuka et al. reference.

This rejection is respectfully traversed in the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

An exemplary embodiment of the present invention, as defined by, for example, independent claim 1 is directed to a task system that includes a storage for storing an event identifier for each event of a plurality of events, a task control device for creating a task based on at least one of the events, and a task processing device for executing a plurality of tasks. Whereupon completing a first task of the plurality of tasks, the task processing device initiates a search for another event identifier, and if the another event identifier is the same as an event identifier corresponding to the first task, then processes a second task, corresponding to the another event identifier using a resource used by the first task. Each event identifier identifies the type of task.

Conventional task processing systems have problems improving the speed of the task processing because it has been impossible to schedule the tasks beforehand and it has been necessary to generate overhead for acquiring and releasing the resources that are necessary for task processing.

Further, conventional task processing systems are not suitable for processing a large number of small tasks, because a lot of overhead for task switching has been necessary.

In stark contrast, an exemplary embodiment provides a task system that stores event identifiers and that, upon completion of a first task, searches those event identifiers to process a second task that has an event identifier that is the same as the first task and which uses the same resource that was used by the first task. In this manner, overhead for acquiring and releasing resources is reduced which increases the speed of task processing. (Page 3, lines 3-8). For example, it becomes possible to process a large number of small tasks at a higher speed than has conventionally been possible. (Page 3, lines 13-15).

This feature of an exemplary embodiment of the invention consists in that after completing a first task, a task processing device searches whether or not an event identifier of an event corresponding to the completed task is registered in a storage, and if it is registered, the task processing device processes a second task using a resource used by the first task, thereby reducing the overhead for acquiring and releasing resources that are necessary for processing the same type of task.

In other words, an exemplary embodiment of the present invention identifies the type of task associated with an event using an event identifier. In this manner, after a first task is completed, a search for a second event identifier which is the same as the first identifier, and, therefore, performs the same type of task, may be found and the resource used by the first task

may be immediately used by the second task.

II. THE 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH REJECTION

The Examiner alleges that claims 1-9 and 14-16 are indefinite. While Applicant submits that such would be clear to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow them to know the metes and bounds of the invention, taking the present Application as a whole, to speed prosecution claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-11, and 13-15 have been amended in accordance with Examiner To's very helpful suggestions.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

III. THE PRIOR ART REJECTION

The Examiner alleges that the Iizuka et al. reference teaches the claimed invention. Applicant submits, however, that there are elements of the claimed invention which are neither taught nor suggested by the Iizuka et al. reference.

In particular, the Iizuka et al. reference does not teach or suggest initiating a search for another event identifier and processing a second task having an event identifier that is the same as a first task, where the event identifier identifies the type of task. As explained above, these features are important for reducing the overhead for acquiring and releasing resources that are necessary for processing the same type of task.

In stark contrast, the Iizuka et al. reference discloses a file control block 15 that stores a resource name of a resource to be accessed, a processing ID, and a waiting queue for recording a task waiting in the access queue. (Col. 3, lines 31-37). None of these items

corresponds to the claimed event identifier which identifies the type of task.

The resource name clearly stores the name of a resource to be accessed. Thus, the resource name stored by the file control block 15 clearly does not correspond to an event identifier that identifies the type of task.

The processing ID also does not correspond to an event identifier that identifies the type of task. Rather, the processing ID uniquely identifies data corresponding to related data processes that are executed by a main task and a sub-task (col. 3, lines 12 - 18).

In particular, the processing ID includes the name of the node associated with the main task and the sub-task, the CPU number associated with the main task and the sub-task, and the time. (Col. 3, line 59 - col. 4, line 8).

In other words, the main task and the sub-task are related because they execute related data processing operations, not because they are the same type of task. Thus, the processing ID clearly does not correspond to an event identifier that identifies the type of task.

The waiting queue also does not correspond to an event identifier that identifies the type of task. Rather, the waiting queue stores processing IDs of tasks which do not correspond to the processing ID of the main task and the sub-task which are currently processing. These processing IDs are stored in the waiting queue when it is determined that the processing ID of a task submitting a file access request does not match the processing ID of the main task and sub-task that are currently processing. Then, when the main task and sub-task finish processing, the system releases the file resource to the next task which has a different processing ID.

In other words, the Iizuka et al. reference merely discloses determining whether a processing ID matches another processing ID to determine whether to allow access to a file

resource or not. If access is denied the processing ID corresponding to the file access request is store in a waiting queue.

The Iizuka et al. reference does not teach or suggest initiating a search for an event identifier at all, let alone a search for an event identifier that is the same as another event identifier.

The Iizuka et al. reference merely compares to processing IDs to determine whether coincidence occurrs.

The Iizuka et al. reference does not teach or suggest searching for a processing ID that matches another processing ID.

While the Iizuka et al. reference discloses searching the waiting queue, the search is to determine the presence of another processing ID and not to determine whether the processing IDs in the waiting queue are the same as another processing ID. Indeed, it has already been determined that any processing ID in the waiting queue does not match the processing ID of a currently processing main task and sub-task.

Clearly, the Iizuka et al. reference does not teach or suggest initiating a search for another event identifier and processing a second task having an event identifier that is the same as a first task, where the event identifier identifies the type of task.

Therefore, the Iizuka et al. reference does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

IV. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-16, all the claims presently pending in the Application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the Application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 7/20/06

James E. Howard
Registration No. 39,715

McGinn Intellectual Property Law Group, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Rd., Suite 200
Vienna, Virginia 22182
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254